

REMARKS

Assignee respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance in view of the foregoing amendment and the following remarks. Assignee amends claims 22, 23 and 30 without prejudice or disclaimer. Assignee adds new claims 36-43.

Double-Patenting/Duplicate Claims Rejections

The Office Action rejects claims 23 provisionally on the ground of non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 22. Assignee has amended claim 23 such that it is not a substantial duplicate of claim 22. Claim 23 now eliminates the first three limitations placing them in the preamble. Accordingly, the method of claim 23 does not include the steps of creating the first database, the second database or third database. Accordingly, since claim 23 is no longer a substantial duplicate of claim 22, Assignee requests withdrawal of the rejection under 37 CFR 1.75.

Double-Patenting Rejections

The Office Action rejects claims 22-25 and 29-32 provisionally on the ground of non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over the claims of U.S. Patent No. 6,654,018. The enclosed Terminal Disclaimer addresses the double patenting rejection. Therefore, these claims are allowable.

CONCLUSION

Having addressed all rejections and objections, Applicants respectfully submit that the subject application is in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited. If necessary, the Commissioner for Patents is authorized to charge or credit the Novak, Druce & Quigg, LLP, Account No. 14-1437 for any deficiency or overpayment.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 12, 2010

By: 

Correspondence Address:
Customer No. 83224

Thomas M. Isaacson
Attorney for Assignee
Reg. No. 44,166
Phone: 410-286-9405
Fax No.: 410-510-1433